SELECT REMARKS.

PRICE ONE SHILLING.

SELECT CRITICAL REMARKS UPON THE ENGLISH VERSION OF THE FIRST TEN CHAPTERS OF GENESIS.

BY THE

REV. JAMES HURDIS, A. M.

Fellow of MAGDALEN COLLEGE, OXFORD.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. JOHNSON, NO. 72, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD.

MDCCXCIII.

ERRATA.

P. 18. l. 9. for σκμια, read σημια.

P. 31. l. 10. dele the point in the Hebrew word.

TO THE

RIGHT REV. JOHN DOUGLAS, D.D.

BISHOP of SALISBURY.

MY LORD,

ABOUT two years ſince I publiſhed a ſmall critical diſſertation upon a word found in Geneſis i. 21. as a ſpecimen of a volume of remarks, which it was my intention to produce as ſoon as my health and leiſure would permit. It fell into the hands of your Lordſhip, and I had the honor to receive from you, not only your approbation of what I had already done, but your advice to proceed. I need not ſay that I felt myſelf extremely proud that my labours ſhould be encou-

couraged by a Prelate, of whom I had been taught to form a very high opinion from the general conſent of the world. It redoubled my efforts, and, had nothing happened to interrupt them, there would at this time have been little to accompliſh of my undertaking. But ſuch has been my lot that almoſt a whole year has elapſed and nothing has been done towards the completion of my deſign. Anxiety and domeſtic loſs, diſtreſs of mind and unſteady health, have driven me away from my ſtudies, and ſome collegial offices upon which I am ſhortly to enter, will prevent my returning to them for a long time. To ſhew your Lordſhip, therefore, that I had not been inattentive to the encouragement you gave me, I at firſt propoſed to epitomize my remarks already collected, and to ſend them in an abridged ſtate into the world, with a promiſe to produce the volume announced

nounced as ſoon as I had leiſure to finiſh it. An epitome was accordingly framed, but deeming it ſtill too diffuſe, I made an abſtract from it. Such abſtract, being nothing more than an abridgment of an abridgment, is now preſented to your Lordſhip,

By your obedient

And obliged humble Servant,

J. H.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE plan upon which the following remarks were conſtructed, has been found to be much more arduous than the Author at firſt expected. The purſuit of Hebrew words and phraſes, through all the paſſages in which they occur, in order to determine their general and moſt probable ſenſe, and to reſtore uniformity and conſiſtency to our tranſlation, by the detection and expulſion of improper interpretations, is a taſk of no ſmall labour and difficulty. The cloſe application and continual ſtreſs of memory and judgment which it requires, can be compared

to nothing but the efforts of the mathematician, whoſe mind is wrought up into a kind of intellectual fever from the intenſeneſs of his attention. But arduous and endleſs as he has found the purſuit, the Author hopes that he ſhall manifeſt its utility by the remarks now produced. He hopes, alſo, that he ſhall ſome day prove it to be feaſible in general, by fulfilling the whole of his engagement. Such alterations as he thought might reaſonably be made, he has with freedom propoſed. He has ſometimes, alſo, ventured to indulge conjecture, not with a deſire of binding his reader to his own ſentiments, nor with a promiſe of maintaining them himſelf, longer than they ſhall ſeem fair and defenſible. He makes no doubt but that in ſome inſtances he may be miſtaken. In ſuch caſes, upon better information he will freely retract. And if at any time, from more accurate reſearch,

and

and a more critical acquaintance with the Hebrew tongue, he ſhall diſcover errors in himſelf, he will not heſitate to own and to correct them.

The reaſon why the Author offers his remarks to the world in this ſhape, is that the world may readily perceive the propriety of ſuch alterations as are propoſed. He might, indeed, have produced a new tranſlation of the books which he wiſhes to ſee more correct. But this is a method of removing inaccuracies which he has never heartily approved of. When a tranſlation of the ſcriptures has been publiſhed by authority, it is not to be haſtily ſet aſide. If it was obtained from the united labours of many learned men, it muſt be ſuppoſed to have ſome excellence, and to be preferable in the main to the verſions of individuals. The duty of the Hebrew ſtudent, therefore, when he

he diſapproves of an authorized tranſlation, ſeems to extend no farther than to the pointing out of ſuch faults as it may bear, and diſpaſſionately propoſing what may appear to him to be amendments. He ſhould ſtate his objections in a manner which may be plain and obvious to the general capacity, and leave the world to determine on the validity of his reaſoning, and the legiſlature to adopt or reject his improvements. If he produces a new tranſlation, the propriety of his alterations is not always obvious, and therefore his tranſlation, though it may be better than the old one, cannot be cordially and confidentially received.

Another reaſon why the Author has choſen rather to publiſh remarks upon our old tranſlation of the Bible than to offer a new verſion of any part of it, is becauſe he is ſatisfied with the general excellence

cellence of that tranſlation, and thinks it will be difficult for any ſet of men ever to produce a new one, which ſhall better expreſs the ſenſe of the original in general, and be at the ſame time ſo plain and intelligible. Were a new verſion of the whole ſcriptures to be required, and the old one to be altogether ſet aſide, it is to be feared that they would no longer be clear to many who now read them with delight and improvement. Since the reign of James I. our language has been gradually extending itſelf, by the adoption of many terms from the Greek, Latin, and other languages. It is evident that many of theſe would find their way into a new tranſlation, and not being a part of the vulgar language, would to a vulgar ear be almoſt as unintelligible as the language of the original ſcriptures. An authorized tranſlation of the Bible, therefore, which is intended for the uſe

of

of all ranks of people, ought to aim at perſpicuity rather than elegance. And ſuch perſpicuity is in general the happy characteriſtic of that which we now have.

It muſt not, however, be underſtood, that the Author of theſe remarks is an advocate for the diſcouragement of new tranſlations. To thoſe who have cultivated talents and an acquaintance with claſſical literature, polite verſions of the ſeveral books of the Old and New Teſtament ought always to be acceptable. It is only in a verſion deſigned to be read in public for the improvement of all who hear, he wiſhes to ſee that ſimplicity and literal reſemblance preſerved, which are ſo remarkable in our old verſion. At the ſame time he cannot help entertaining a wiſh that ſuch old verſion was carefully reviſed, and where it appears faulty, corrected and improved.

SELECT CRITICAL REMARKS, &c.

CHAP. I.

v. 2. "AND the Spirit of God moved "(מרחפת) upon the face of "the waters." επεφερετο.

There are only two other inſtances in which the root רחפ is uſed. They are theſe.

Deut. xxxii. 11. "As an eagle ſtirreth "up her neſt, fluttereth (ירחף) over her "young." επεποθησε.

Jer. xxiii. 9. "All my bones ſhake." (רחפו) εσαλευθη.

It appears from hence that ſome word expreſſive of a tremulous motion is to be deſired rather than *moved*. Milton ſeems

to have thought ſo, by the manner in which he has introduced this paſſage into his *Paradiſe Loſt*.

> Darkneſs profound
> Cover'd th' abyſs; but on the watery calm
> His brooding wings the Spirit of God outſpread.

Here the curious reader will be gratified to obſerve that the Poet borrows his idea of the Spirit *outſpreading his wings upon the waters* from comparing the paſſage in Deuteronomy, with the paſſage in Geneſis. His interpretation ſeems to be right, and we ſhall perhaps better expreſs the ſenſe of Moſes, if we ſay, "The Spirit of God *hovered* upon "the face of the waters." To *hover*, thus applied to רחף, is the more proper, becauſe it does not appear to have been appropriated to any other root.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

v. 13. "The ſame is it that compaſſeth "the whole land of Ethiopia" (כוש).

In the margin we read *Cuſh*. Remove *Ethiopia* into the margin, and inſert *Cuſh* in the text. For if *Ethiopia* be admitted inſtead of *Cuſh* here, there is no reaſon why *Tigris* ſhould not take place of *Hiddekel* in the next verſe. But we ſhould rather follow the Hebrew than the Greek; and it is perhaps to be wiſhed that אשור and פרת now rendered *Aſſyria* and *Euphrates*, were read as they are found in Moſes. Indeed it would be a good general rule, to give all the Hebrew names as they are written in the original, and to inſert in the margin over againſt them ſuch as may be better known, for the ſake of elucidation.

But this rule ſhould not be extended to the New Teſtament. For there it ſeems more proper to render names as we find them in the text of the Old Teſtament, and not as we read them in the Greek. Thus, for inſtance, it is better to ſay *Iſaiah* than *Eſay* or *Eſaias*, *Noah* than *Noe*, *Elijah* than *Elias*, *Hoſea* than *Oſee*, *Eliſha* than *Eliſeus*, and ſo on in numberleſs inſtances; becauſe ſuch a method of rendering preſerves a connection between the two parts of our tranſlation, which is very neceſſary to enable the unlearned reader perfectly to underſtand it.

---

v. 15. "And the Lord God took the "man, and put him into the garden of "Eden, to dreſs it (לעבדה) and to keep "it."

The

The tranſlation *to dreſs*, which is here given to the root עבד, is one of the moſt rare, there being but one other inſtance in which it is uſed. In verſe 5 of this chapter it was rendered *to till*, and it is again ſo rendered in chap. iii. 23. It ſeems, therefore, but reaſonable that it ſhould here have the ſame tranſlation, and we may ſay that the Lord God placed the man in the garden of Eden, *to till it* and to keep it: unleſs we adopt *to cultivate* inſtead of *to till*. *To cultivate* will, indeed, be found to agree with many paſſages which now require different tranſlations, and may be uſed very properly with the garden in this inſtance, and with the vineyard in Deut. xxviii. 39.

A more exceptionable tranſlation of עבד is to be found in the two following paſſages.

Deut. xxi. 4. "And the elders of that "city ſhall bring down the heifer unto a "rough valley, which is neither eared "(יעבר) nor ſown."

Iſaiah xxx. 24. "The oxen likewiſe, "and the young aſſes that ear (עברי) "the ground."

To ear is become obſolete, and perhaps few who read the Bible underſtand it in its true ſenſe *to plough*. It ought, therefore, in both theſe inſtances, to give way to a more intelligible tranſlation. The LXX have ειργαζαι and ειργαζομενοι, and according to the uſual method of rendering this root, we may ſay in the firſt inſtance *wrought*, and in the ſecond *work*. But perhaps *ploughed* and *plough*, though never applied elſewhere to עבר, will be the beſt and moſt obvious interpretation.

In

In 2 Kings x. 19—21, 22, 23. we find "the worſhippers of Baal," five times repeated as a tranſlation of עבדי הבעל, although עבדי יהוה in the laſt verſe of the four, was rendered "the ſervants of the "Lord." This was an unneceſſary variation. *Servants* is the proper and moſt uſual tranſlation of עבדי. *Worſhippers* does not, I think, occur any where elſe, nor is it requiſite here. Say, therefore, *the ſervants of Baal.* The LXX make no diſtinction, but render it δουλοι throughout.

In Jer. xv. 14. we find the following paſſage, "And I will make thee to paſs "(והעברתי) with thine enemies into a "land which thou knoweſt not." The ſenſe of the Hebrew is here diſputable. Some copies have ר inſtead of ד. The latter, however, ſeems to prevail moſt, and it agrees ſo well with the context

that we may ſafely pronounce it to be right. The LXX found it in their copy, and have therefore rendered the word by καταδουλωσω. Say, therefore, *And I will cauſe thee to ſerve thine enemies in a land which thou knoweſt not.* This exactly correſponds with the prophecy of Moſes in Deut. xxviii.

---

v. 23. " And Adam ſaid, This is now " (הפעם) bone of my bone and fleſh of " my fleſh."

I do not pauſe at this word to object to its tranſlation. *Now* is ſufficiently emphatical to expreſs the full force of the original. It would, however, be ſomewhat ſtrengthened, if inſtead of *This is now*, we read *This now is.* But Milton, it ſeems, was not ſatisfied with this tranſlation. He makes Adam begin his ſpeech upon the firſt ſight of Eve thus, *This turn*

hath

hath made amends. *This turn* is a literal tranſlation of רפעם. But if we compare all the paſſages in which it occurs, there does not appear any neceſſity for rendering it ſo preciſely.

The tranſlation of the latter part of this verſe may be objected to with more reaſon: "ſhe ſhall be called wo-"man, becauſe ſhe was taken out "of man." For זאת, which is here twice rendered *ſhe*, was at the beginning of the verſe *this*. *This* is the uſual interpretation, and perhaps there will be no impropriety in rendering the whole verſe more conformably to the Hebrew, thus,

And Adam ſaid, This now is bone of my bone and fleſh of my fleſh; this ſhall be called woman, becauſe out of man was this taken.

We muſt not quit this chapter without obſerving that the tranſlators ſeem to have been ſomewhat too negligent in rendering the word אדם. It is at firſt tranſlated *man*, but at the 19th verſe it is *Adam*. When *man* had been once dropped, it would, perhaps, have been better to have relinquiſhed it entirely. But we find that the word is afterwards ſometimes tranſlated *man* and ſometimes *Adam*, which contributes not a little to confuſe the latter part of the chapter, and entirely deſtroys the diſtinction between אדם and איש. It may not, therefore, be improper to fix a preciſe point, at which it ſhall ceaſe to be *the man*, and ever after be *Adam*. The proper place for this change ſeems to be verſe 21. The latter part of the chapter, with this alteration, will run thus,

18. And

18. And the Lord God ſaid, It is not good that the man (אדם) ſhould be alone: I will make him an help-mate.

19. And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beaſt of the field, and every fowl of the air, and brought them unto the man (האדם) to ſee what he would call them: and whatſoever the man (האדם) called every living creature, that was the name thereof, or *it's name.*

20. And the man (האדם) gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beaſt of the field; but for the man (אדם) there was not found an help-mate.

21. And the Lord God cauſed a deep ſleep to fall upon Adam (האדם), and he ſlept: and he took one of his ribs, and cloſed up the fleſh inſtead thereof, *inſtead of it.*

22. And the rib which the Lord God had taken from Adam (האדם) built he up

up into a woman, and brought her unto Adam (האדם).

23. And Adam (האדם) ſaid, This now is bone of my bone and fleſh of my fleſh; this ſhall be called woman, becauſe out of man (מאיש) was this taken.

24. Therefore ſhall a man (איש) leave his father and his mother, and ſhall cleave unto his wife, and they ſhall be one fleſh.

25. And they were both naked, Adam (האדם) and his wife; and were not aſhamed.

The LXX make uſe of *Adam* for their interpretation at verſe 16, and never afterwards drop it, except once in verſe 18.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

v. 6. "And the Lord ſaid unto Cain, "Why art thou wroth? and why is thy "countenance fallen?"

7 "If thou doeſt well, ſhalt thou not "be accepted? and if thou doeſt not "well, ſin lieth at the door. And unto "thee ſhall be his deſire, and thou ſhalt "rule over him."

I have quoted the whole paſſage, that the reader may readily diſcover the want of connection between the beginning and end of verſe 7. Neither the Greek nor the Engliſh verſion afford us here a ſatisfactory tranſlation. The Greek, however, ſeems to be the beſt. To render שאת *thou ſhalt be accepted*, or according to the margin, *thou ſhalt have the excellency*,

lency, is to give it a ſenſe which cannot be maintained by any ſimilar example. Where it is not a ſubſtantive it is evidently to be taken for the infinitive Kal of נשא and ſignifies *to bear, to carry, to take up, &c.* Thus in Gen. xliv. 1. we read, "Fill the men's ſacks with food as "much as they can carry," (יכלון שאת) i. e. *are able to bear:* in Deut. i. 9. "I am "not able to bear," (שאת) in Jer. xvii. 27. "and not to bear," (שאת) and in many other inſtances. Unleſs, therefore, it be a ſubſtantive in this place, it muſt be tranſlated in the ſame manner. But it appears plainly to be a verb, and as a verb the LXX have rendered it not amiſs by προσφερω. And if שאת be a verb in the infinitive, it ſeems likely, from the conſtruction of the Hebrew text, that לפתח is a verb alſo. The LXX thought ſo, and therefore rendered it by διαιρεω. They ſeem to be again right, in concluding

ing חטאת to be a verb, and not a ſubſtantive. If it be a ſubſtantive there appears no ſufficient reaſon why it ſhould not be written חטאה. Again, they ſeem to tranſlate רבץ very juſtly ησυχασον, and refer it with evident propriety to the latter part of the verſe. But notwithſtanding all this, I think that neither they nor the Engliſh tranſlators have hit the true ſenſe of the verſe. The Engliſh evidently found in their copy לפתח, and the LXX in their's, as appears from their tranſlation לפתח. There is room, therefore, to believe, though Dr. Kennicot found but one variation (לפטח) that לפתח may not be the true reading. Perhaps it might have been originally לפתה. I will indulge the conjecture. and offer a new tranſlation.

6 " And

6. " And the Lord ſaid unto Cain, " Why art thou wroth? and why is thy " countenance fallen?"

7. " If thou doeſt well *to bear*, and if " thou doeſt not well *to entice, haſt thou* " *not ſinned? Lie down*, and unto thee " ſhall be his deſire, and thou ſhalt rule " over him."

It may be conſtrued in nearly the ſame manner, if we ſuppoſe לפתח, which the LXX evidently found in their copy, to be the true reading. For in 2 Sam. iii. 25. we find לפתחך rendered " to deceive " thee."

---

v. 15. " And the Lord ſet a mark " (ישם אות) upon Cain, leſt any find- " ing him ſhould kill him."

The ſenſe of this paſſage muſt be miſtaken. אות is a noun which occurs either

ther in the *ſingular* or *plural*, in more than ſeventy inſtances, but is in no other inſtance rendered *a mark*. It is moſt commonly tranſlated *a ſign* or *token*. It is once, in Num. ii. 2. called *an enſign*, and in Pſ. lxxiv. 4. *enſigns*. Twice, in Num. xiv. 22. and Deut. xi. 3. it is rendered *miracles*. It does not appear very conſiſtent with any of theſe ſenſes, to call it *a mark*, and therefore I think it ſhould be rendered here alſo *a ſign* or *token*. To confirm this tranſlation, let it be obſerved that the verb שום is often found in conjunction with the ſubſtantive אות in other paſſages of the Bible. They form together a proverbial expreſſion, ſignifying *to ſhew a ſign* or *give a token*, as will readily appear from the following inſtances.

Exod. x. 2. "My ſigns which I have "done." אתותי אשר שמתי. τα σημεια μου α εποιησα.

Pſ. lxxiv. 4. "They ſet up their en- "ſigns for ſigns." שמו אותתם אתות. εθεντο τα σημεια αυτων σημεια.

Pſ. lxxviii. 43. "How he had wrought "his ſigns in Egypt." אשר שם אתותיו. ως εθετο τα σημεια αυτου.

Pſ. cv. 27. "They ſhewed his ſigns "among them." שמו בם דברי אתותיו. εθετο εν αυτοις τους λογους των σημειων αυτου.

Iſ. lxvi. 19. "And I will ſet a ſign "among them." ושמתי בהם אות. καταλειψω επ' αυτων σημειον.

Jer. xxxii. 20. "Which haſt ſet ſigns." אשר שמת אתות. ος εποιησας σημεια.

Ezek. xiv. 8. "And I will make him "a ſign." והשמותידו לאות. θησομαι αυτον εις ψημον.

The

The paſſage, therefore, which now ſtands thus, " And the Lord ſet a mark " upon Cain, leſt any finding him ſhould " kill him," ought to be rendered as follows.

And the Lord gave a token (or *ſhewed a ſign*) *unto Cain, that whoſoever found him he ſhould not kill him.*

לקין may be more properly rendered *unto Cain*, than as we find it in the old verſion *upon Cain.*

---

v. 23. " For I have ſlain a man to my " wounding." (לפצעי).

There is no other inſtance in which this word is rendered *wounding.* It is every where elſe *wound*, and in the plu-

ral *wounds*. We muſt therefore ſo render it here.

" And a young man." (וילד)

We may ſay *a child*. It is ſometimes rendered *a ſon*.

" To my hurt." (לחברתי)

This word is no where elſe rendered *hurt*. We may ſay *to my bruiſe*. See Iſ. i. 6.

The whole paſſage, therefore, may be tranſlated thus, *For a man have I ſlain to my wound, and a child to my bruiſe*.

It ſeems likely from hence that the crime of which Lamech here diſburdened his conſcience, was the murder of one of his own children. Some one of them had

had probably riſen up againſt him, wounded and bruiſed him, and the father in a tranſport of fury had killed him for his audacity. Thus will it readily appear why his puniſhment ſhould be more heavy than that of Cain. If he had ſlain only *a man* or *a young man*, his crime would not have been ſo great as Cain's, for Cain ſlew his brother. But if we ſuppoſe him to have ſlain *a child*, we muſt allow that he was guilty of a more unnatural and atrocious offence than Cain. It might therefore juſtly be ſaid that Cain ſhould be puniſhed *ſeven-fold* but Lamech *ſeventy and ſeven-fold*.

But this will not well accord with verſe 15 of this chapter, to which Moſes refers us. יקם muſt be improperly tranſlated either here or there. Perhaps the ſenſe of verſe 15 may be this. *And the Lord ſaid unto him, Therefore, whoſoever ſlayeth*

Cain, he (Cain) *ſhall be avenged ſeven-fold. And the Lord gave a token unto Cain, that whoſoever found him he ſhould not ſmite* (or *wound*) *him.* If this be right, it will be neceſſary, in order to render יקם alike in both paſſages, to ſuppoſe that Lamech had been wounded and hurt only by one of his children, and that theſe words were uttered in his paſſion. *Adah and Zillah, ye wives of Lamech, hearken unto my ſpeech; for a man will I ſlay to my wound and a child to my bruiſe. For Cain ſhall be avenged ſeven-fold and Lamech ſeventy and ſeven-fold.*

This tranſlation will at leaſt have the merit of being uniform, for כי which occurs twice in the text is in both inſtances rendered *for.* In the old verſion it is firſt *for* and then *if*, interpretations which are inconſiſtent with each other. The latter, indeed, ſeems evidently to be erroneous,

roneous, becauſe it cannot be ſupported without rendering the ſucceeding ו *truly*, a ſenſe which we may very reaſonably deem inadmiſſible.

CHAP. VI.

v. 4. "There were giants in the earth "in thoſe days."

I know not why הנפלים ſhould be rendered *giants* here or in Num. xiii. 33. It is true we find γιγαντες in the Septuagint, but the word evidently means no more than *conquerors* or *deſtroyers*, *warriors*, men who ſpent their whole time in endeavouring to *caſt down* or *overthrow*, which is the literal ſenſe of the root נפל in Hiphil. We may ſay, therefore, in-

ſtead of *giants*, *There were conquerors in the earth in thoſe days.* The LXX apply γιγαντες immediately afterwards, in the ſame verſe to הגברים which we render very properly *mighty men.*

" And alſo after that when the ſons " of God," &c.

It ſhould, perhaps, be rendered, *and alſo after the ſons of God, &c.* The meaning of Moſes ſeems to be, that there were *conquerors* in the earth both before and after the epoch which he had juſt mentioned, viz. *when the ſons of God ſaw the daughters of men.* And therefore he immediately proceeds, *theſe are the mighty men of old, &c.* Let them, therefore, be *men* and not *giants.*

---

v. 14. " And

v. 14. " And thou ſhalt pitch it (כפרת)
" within and without with pitch."

Ασφαλτωσεις τη ασφαλτω ſay the LXX. But perhaps they are not to be followed in this interpretation. In our own verſion there occurs no other inſtance in which the verb כפר is rendered *to pitch*, or the ſubſtantive כפר *pitch;* nor have I ever found them in the Greek ſo rendered again. In the latter the general interpretation is εξιλαομαι, in the former *to make atonement for*. It ſeems, therefore, that the root may ſometimes mean *to hide, to cover*, or *to conceal*, for ſins may be ſaid to be *covered* or *hidden* when they are *atoned for*. And this may perhaps be its true ſignification here. The firſt part of the verſe may give directions only relative to the ſkeleton of the ark, *Make thee an ark of gopher timber*. The latter part may be underſtood to ſpecify with what

wood

wood it ſhould be planked within and without. As if it had been ſaid, *Make thee an ark of gopher timber; rooms ſhalt thou make in the ark, and ſhalt cover it within and without with* כפר i. e. *with cypreſs*, as the Greek renders it Cant. i. 14. and iv. 13. or *with camphire*, according to our own tranſlation.

But that this is the true ſenſe of the paſſage I will not maintain. It muſt be left to the ingenious to determine. Let me only obſerve, that *to cover* is at leaſt as probable an interpretation of כפר as *to pitch*. Perhaps more ſo, becauſe it could not be neceſſary *to pitch* the ark *within* as well as *without*.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

v. 18. " And the waters prevailed and " were increaſed (ירבו) greatly."

The ſame word was rendered in the preceding verſe *increaſed;* and it is to be obſerved that Moſes is here giving, not a tautological, but a progreſſive deſcription of the increaſe of the flood, which, if rightly underſtood, is as ſublime as any part of his writings. I take the following to be the true ſenſe of the paſſage, beginning in the middle of verſe 17.

17. And the waters increaſed, and bare up the ark, and it was lifted up above the earth.

18. And

18. And the waters prevailed and increaſed greatly (מאד) upon the earth, and the ark went upon the face of the waters.

19. And the waters prevailed very greatly (מאד מאד) upon the earth, and covered all the high mountains that were under the whole heaven.

20. Fifteen cubits above prevailed the waters, and covered the mountains.

The progreſs of the deluge is here deſcribed in a climax truly awful. The ark is firſt repreſented to us as juſt lifted from the ground. We then ſee it moving along upon an immenſe body of waters, among the ruins of a world gradually diſappearing: and laſt of all, behold it floating alone upon the flood, the very mountains themſelves having diſappeared under the waves of a univerſal ocean.

The

The tranſlation of the paſſage, as it now ſtands in our Engliſh verſion, is inferior to the Septuagint, and even to the Latin Vulgate. Dr. Geddes has given it great ſpirit.

CHAP. VIII.

v. 3. " And after the end of the hun-
" dred and fifty days the waters were
" abated." (יחסרו)

This root is in verſe 5 of this chapter rendered *to decreaſe*. We may therefore ſay, *and from the end of the hundred and fifty days the waters decreaſed*. The ſtrict ſenſe of חסר is *to fail* or *to want*. *To lack* is often given as an interpretation of

of it, but it may well be diſmiſſed for its vulgarity. For inſtance,

Gen. xviii. 28. "Peradventure there "ſhall lack (יחסרון) five of the fifty righ- "teous." *want.*

Exod. xvi. 18. "And he that gather- "ed little had no lack." (החסיר) *want* or *need, wanted not* or *did not want.*

Deut. ii. 7. "Theſe forty years the "Lord thy God hath been with thee, "thou haſt lacked (חסרת) nothing." *wanted.*

Deut. viii. 9. "A land wherein thou "ſhalt eat bread without ſcarceneſs; "thou ſhalt not lack (תחסר) any thing in "it." *want.*

2 Sam. iii. 29. "That lacketh (חסר) "bread." *wanteth.*

1 Kings xi. 22. "What haſt thou "lacked?" (חסר) *wanted*

Nehem.

Nehem. ix. 21. "Yea, forty years "didſt thou ſuſtain them in the wilder- "neſs, ſo that they lacked (חסרו) nothing." *wanted.*

Prov. vi. 32. "Lacketh (חסר) under- "ſtanding." *wanteth* or *is void of.*

Prov. xii. 9. "Lacketh (חסר) bread." *wanteth.*

Prov. xxviii. 27. "He that giveth to the poor ſhall not lack." (מחסור) *want.*

Eccleſ. ix. 8. "Let thy head lack "(יחסר) no ointment." *want.*

---

v. 8. "Alſo he ſent forth a dove from "him, to ſee if the waters were abated "(הקלו) from off the face of the ground."

I believe this word will be found to belong to the root קלה, and that it is uſed in the ſame ſenſe here as in Lev. ii.

14.

14. " green ears of corn dried (קלוי) by " the fire," and in all thoſe paſſages in which we read of *parched* or *dried corn.* It ſeems to ſignify *to dry by exhalation.* See Jer. xxix. 22. And therefore it is probable that we ſhall not fall much ſhort of the true ſenſe of the original, if we ſay that Noah ſent out the dove, " to ſee if " the waters *were exhaled* from off the face " of the ground."

This tranſlation will appear much to advantage, if the reader compares it with the preceding verſe. For there we are told that Noah firſt ſent forth a raven, to ſee if the waters were dried up from the earth. The bird went to and fro, not finding food, perhaps, any where but in the ark. It ſeems at length to have returned no more: and this might induce him to conclude that the waters had ſo far ſubſided, that it was able to ſuſtain itſelf

ſelf upon the remains of carcaſes left unconſumed by the waters, or other food which was natural to it. His next concern, therefore, was probably to know when the ſun had exhauſted the ſtagnated waters, and rendered the ground hard and dry, that he might venture forth with ſafety. He accordingly ſent out the dove, *to ſee if the waters were exhaled from off the face of the ground.* To confirm this interpretation, the next verſe begins thus, " But the dove found no reſt " for the ſole of her foot."

CHAP. X.

v. 4. " Kittim." (כתים)

It

It ſhould be *Chittim.* See Num. xxiv. 24. Iſ. xxiii. 1—12. Jer. ii. 13. Ezek. xxvii. 6. Dan. xi. 30.

FINIS.